

REMARKS

Claims 11-16 are now pending in the above-referenced application, and these claims stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,303 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter "Watanabe"). Reconsideration of the rejection is requested for the following reasons.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every limitation is identically disclosed in a single prior art reference. See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Independent claim 13 recites the step of reading **audio data assigned to** the navigation destination from the memory of a **navigation card**. There is no disclosure in Watanabe that meets this limitation. In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Final Office Action, the Examiner cites a portion of Watanabe that indicates that the apparatus of Watanabe includes a voice recognition unit for enabling voice input and/or a record card reader for reading data recorded on an IC card or a magnetic card (citing Watanabe, col. 4, lines 1-10). The Examiner asserts that this cited passage explains that "said navigation method and recording medium compris[es] the step of reading audio data associated with¹ the navigation destination from the memory of the navigation card." (Final Office Action, page 3, lines 1-3).

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-recited portion of Watanabe does not indicate that audio data assigned to the navigation destination is read from a navigation card. Initially, it should be noted that the above-recited portion of Watanabe merely states that "it is possible to add a voice recognition unit for enabling voice input and/or a record card reader for reading data recorded on an IC card or a magnetic card." (Watanabe, col. 4, lines 1-3). The first half of this statement, i.e., "it is possible to add a

¹ Claim 13 actually recites "assigned to," not "associated with."

voice recognition unit for enabling voice input,” is completely separate from, and unrelated to, the second half of the statement, i.e., “[it is possible to add] a record card reader for reading data recorded on an IC card or a magnetic card,” since the voice recognition unit for enabling voice input is a mechanism for receiving input from the driver, thereby allowing the driver to enter destinations and/or instruct the CPU. (See Watanabe, col. 3, lines 53-58). While Watanabe indicates that audio data may be supplied from an information storage device (3) (see Watanabe, col. 5, lines 19-24), this information storage device (3) is distinct from the IC card, since the disclosure of Watanabe clearly differentiates between an IC card which may be optionally added, versus an information storage device which is part of the basic system. In particular, Watanabe indicates that the information storage device may be implemented as a CD-ROM, rather than as an IC card. (Watanabe, col. 4, lines 54-56). Furthermore, Watanabe does not indicate what type of data may be stored on the optional IC card, and there is no suggestion in Watanabe of storing acoustic information on the optional IC card.

For the foregoing reasons, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest the claimed limitation of reading audio data assigned to the navigation destination from the memory of a navigation card, as recited in claim 13. Accordingly, claim 13 and its dependent claims 14 and 15 are not anticipated by Watanabe.

Since independent claim 11 recites a navigation card that comprises audio data assigned to at least one navigation destination, it is submitted that claim 11 and its dependent claim 12 are likewise not anticipated by Watanabe for the reasons stated in connection with claim 13.

With regard to independent claim 16, Watanabe not only fails to disclose or suggest “audio data” stored on the navigation card, but Watanabe also does not disclose or suggest reading a navigation destination from a navigation card since Watanabe does not specify the type of information that may be extracted from the “optional” IC card.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that claims 11-16 are not anticipated by Watanabe.
Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/24, 2004

By:



Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

(by
J. Lu
R. no.
36,197)